94 2.72
F 68

Causes of the Distress in Lancashire.

MEMOIR DRAWN UP BY THE DISTRICT CONFERENCE OF THE CHESHIRE AND LANCASHIRE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEES ASSEMBLED AT MANCHESTER, JULY 6, 1862.

DISTRESS has overtaken the operatives engaged in the cotton manufacture. Mills and workshops have been put on short time, and many have been entirely closed. The workpeople have been compelled to use the small sums they had stored up for support in their old age, and the less fortunate or provident have been compelled to accept the aid of the benevolent, or seek the assistance of the parish.

Various plans have been proposed to alleviate or prevent further extension of this distress. Meetings have been held, deputations have had interviews, and Committees have been formed to obtain the suspension of the Labour Test. Relief Committees have been established, soup-kitchens have been opened, and individual benevolence has been exercised unseen and unheard of.

In Lancashire and Cheshire 1700 mills and workshops are engaged in the cotton manufacture, and give employment to 350,000 hands. By the last returns only about two in every seven of these mills were working full time. Scarcely two in every seven of the hands were earning a full week's wages; four in every seven were working short time, and one in every seven was wholly unemployed. At the beginning of last year 50,000 bales of cotton per week were consumed: the consumption is now reduced to 25,000, and even that quantity must speedily be diminished.

The stock of cotton in Liverpool on the 27th of June, 1861, was 1,123,300 bales; at the end of June 1862 it was reduced to 213,340 bales. The quantity expected to arrive by the end of this year is 600,000 bales. This gives the total of 813,340 bales to meet a consumption of 25,000 per week, and an export of 5000.

With our present diminished consumption we shall therefore have consumed our entire stock by the end of the year, and be wholly dependant on arrivals.

Four-fifths of the cotton used in our factories is obtained from those States which are now overrun by the contending Federal and Confederates' armies. In an Address issued by the Manchester Foreign Affairs Association, at the time of its formation, five years ago, the position to which we now find ourselves reduced was foreseen and urged upon the attention of the people of this district. It was then said, February 6, 1857:—

"Of the twenty-five millions worth of cotton annually consumed by Great Britain we are dependent on the slave-holding states of America for twenty millions. A war with the United States, a slave insurrection, would bring on Manchester a worse fate than that of Canton. Yet the United States is not the only country in the world from which cotton can be obtained. It is impossible to imagine any concern of deeper moment for the British Government than that of opening up other supplies. England, besides, is mistress of India, and is bound to leave nothing untried to increase its productions and to improve the condition of its inhabitants. The people of Manchester are at least fully aware of the negative value of the Government in that respect. That inertness their efforts have failed to remove; its cause their discrimination has failed to discover. The Turkish Empire, at half the distance, offers a still more promising field; there a commercial system of restriction imposed by England has placed a duty on exports amounting to prohibition. If, therefore, the supply of raw material for the mills of Lancashire depends on the acts of a foreign country, which our Government has done everything to exasperate and to drive into an alliance with, or dependence on, Russia, it is because we have neglected India, and excluded Turkey. *An insurrection in the Slave States cannot be more difficult to determine by diplomatic means than the insurrections which have in our times twice changed the fate of France.* There still remains behind the not impossible occurrence of an unfavourable season on that one spot, and which may, even without human art or agency, snap the sinews of the commercial existence of this land. This is, therefore, *a question of life or death to every Lancashire operative.* It may cost him some trouble to look into; but it is worth some trouble to save his home from famine."

The value of these words consists, first, in their having been uttered at a time when few thought it possible that the operatives of Lancashire would ever be reduced to the state of wretchedness they now endure, and, secondly, in their indicating the means whereby that state might be avoided, or, being arrived at, could be remedied. The voice of warning was disregarded, and the penalty is now being paid. But suffering has not brought forth wisdom, for the cotton-producing States having rebelled, the supply of cotton being cut off, and starvation being brought on Lancashire, an agitation is commenced to induce the Government to recognise the Confederate States as a separate and independent nation. How cotton can come out of this act is as yet wholly unexplained.

Fourteen months since, those States were acknowledged by the English Government as a belligerent Power and as having belligerent rights, and it subsequently recognised the Government of those States as an independent Power, capable of forming compacts and Treaties, by instructing Mr. BUNCH, our Consul at Charlestown, to negotiate with it for the purpose of obtaining its adhesion to the Declaration of Paris. The demand for recognition is also accompanied by one for mediation. Mediation is arbitration;* arbitration may take place on the consent of both the contending parties; it occurs only at a time when both are exhausted, and neither sees a prospect of success; it can only be accepted at the hand of an impartial judge, and could not possibly be accompanied by any act on the part of the arbiter which constitutes a direct denial of the claims put forth by one of the disputants. Arbitration cannot yet succeed, for the Government of Washington would scout the idea of submitting its claims to arbitration. Nor is either party exhausted: both anticipate ultimate success. England is not an impartial judge, and the formal act of recognition would be to brand with injustice the conduct of the Northern States and repel all confidence they might have reposed in our impartiality. But that confidence does not exist: they remember our conduct in the *Trent* affair, and have justly accused us of raising the Southern States to the position of belligerents before they had won a battle or put a ship-of-war or a privateer to sea. In a despatch from Mr. SEWARD to Mr. ADAMS, dated April 10, 1861, Mr. SEWARD says:—

"If, as the President does not at all apprehend, you shall unhappily find HER MAJESTY'S Government tolerating the application of the so-called Seceding States, or wavering about it, you will not leave them to suppose for a moment that they can grant that application and remain the friends of the United States. You may even assure them promptly, in that case, that if they *determine to recognise they may at the same time prepare to enter into alliance with the enemies of this Republic.* You alone will represent your country at London, and you will represent the whole of it there. When you are asked to divide that duty with others, diplomatic relations between the Government of Great Britain and this Government will be suspended, and will remain so until it shall be seen which of the two is most strongly entrenched in the confidence of their respective nations and of mankind."—*North America*, No. II., p. 40.

Our experience of the character of mediation, as practised by the present Prime Minister, proves it to be exercised to England's detriment. Never was there a case in which the people of England were more desirous that their Government should mediate, than in that of Austria and Hungary in 1848-9. Mediation was then solicited and refused; when compliance was made to the request it was a day too late, and a day afterward it could not have been offered. Again, when Austria offered to submit the matter between herself and CHARLES ALBERT to the mediation of England, the Foreign Secretary refused. In the present case our mediation has not been sought. For England to act now, therefore, would not be to mediate but to intervene; intervention would be war; war with the North to get cotton from the South.

But does any one imagine that any act of intervention would take place without a criminal intent, or under a belief that it would lead to the production of cotton from the Confederate States to set our mills in operation? If so, it must be because he is entirely ignorant of the character and consequences of past acts of intervention on the part of this country in the affairs of other nations. He would also exhibit an equally culpable ignorance or forgetfulness of two facts patent to all: First; the stores of cotton in the vicinity of those places which the Federal forces have approached have invariably been destroyed. A late letter from New Orleans says:—

"Make up your mind to one thing, in so far as Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas are concerned, every bale of cotton will be burned so soon as Northern forces appear, and if any man tries to save his cotton, his neighbours will burn it for him. The feeling is: if we are not to have our own way, no money shall be made out of us by any one else. Already, from the most reliable accounts, one million bales of cotton are burnt between here and Memphis—in short, all cotton along the river banks!"

* Mediation is negotiation conducted by a third party. Arbitration is the absolute decision by a third party of points submitted to it by the parties at variance

P1672
R2282

In those few places where the seed could be sown, it has been done in such small quantities as will produce little more cotton than will supply the individual wants of the planters for seed and home spun; therefore, if the vast armies of the North were withdrawn, or swept from the soil of the South, and their navies recalled from her ports, we should be unable to obtain an immediate supply of cotton. In twelve months hence we should be in precisely the same position, because of the very small amount of seed sown. Two years must therefore elapse, even under the most favourable circumstances, before our ordinary supply could be resumed.

In addition to the continued scarcity of cotton we should have diminished employment, dear bread, and increased taxes. England is dependent upon foreign countries for one-third of the bread of her population. By the diplomatic action of the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, and the criminality of our public servants, four of the great granaries of the world—Africa, Turkey, Hungary, and Polaud—are closed to us as sources of supply, and the principal part of our imported corn comes from the United States and from Russia. Intervention and war with the United States would deprive us of the grain exported from thence, and would reduce us to dependance on Russia for nearly one-third of our bread.

A conflict with the United States would greatly affect our trade. United States privateers would prey upon our commerce, but England could not issue a single letter of marque. Everyone knows that operations of war are not conducted without funds. Our taxation has in a few years risen from forty to seventy millions sterling annually. Lord Brougham has said the national debt is a pledge of peace — surely a national expenditure of 72,000,000*l.* ought to be a pledge for non-intervention. We, nevertheless, find some of the working classes of Lanchashire, in the bewilderment by which they are surrounded, aud the ignorance in which they are enveloped, lending themselves to this cry for mediation which is led by men who are merely endeavouring to provide grounds of justification to the servants of the Crown for interfering in the internal concerns of iudependent States, and in such a way as must lead to a disturbance of our commercial relations with the whole world.

Mr. Urquhart has pointed out that wherever a country exists that produces raw produce, there England sends her agents to buy, and Russia her emissary to convulse. This remark applies no less to the United States than any other couutry. If those States have hitherto enjoyed a lengthened period of prosperity, it was because of their commercial position.

In relating a conversation between himself and Prince Gortschakoff, Mr. Appleton, the United States Minister at the Court of St. Petersburg, says the Prince replied: "It (the U.S.) is the only commercial counterpoise in the world to Great Britain, and Russia would do nothing, therefore, to diminish its just power and influence."

This is the reason why the power of the United States has been fostered by Russia. That fostering care needs no longer to be exercised. Three-quarters of a century ago Russia formed the Armed Neutrality against England. Her perseverance in the advocacy of the principles there enunciated has been rewarded by success. England is bound by the Declaration of Paris not to employ her maritime strength in covering the seas with her privateers in time of war and seizing her enemies' goods. Russia, therefore, does not fear England, the time for convulsion in the United States has arrived, and the institution of Slavery is to be the means whereby it shall be effected. In his first interview with Mr. Clay on his arrival at St. Petersburg, the Emperor said "that in addition to all former ties we were bound together by a common sympathy in the common cause of emancipation."—*North America*, No. II., p. 256.

This was pointed out nine years ago by Mr. Urquhart, when he said: "It is true that the United States are not emasculated by a Cabinet, and may escape her control; but they will not do so upon their own soil. When she brings down upon them a complication involved in their local or international passions, they will be helpless."

Another object is accomplished by the agitation for mediation: the attention of the people is diverted from those treasonable acts of the public servants by which the prevailing distress has been mainly produced. The questions, "Why is Lancashire dependent upon America for her cotton?" "How is it that England is dependent upon the United States and Russia for her imported corn?" involve an inquiry into the mysteries of diplomacy.

The cotton manufacturer has been dependent upon America for his raw material, while vast tracts of territory in India were producing cottons little inferior to those of the United States, which could be bought on the spot at 1¼d. per pouud, or about half the cost of American cotton at the place of production. Carriage to the seaboard and freight to England, however, gave it an inferior position in our market, and prevented it from competing with the American cotton produced at greater cost. While England has been preaching "free trade," and English capital, skill, and enterprise have been spent in uniting together cities and uations by railways, electric telegraphs, and fleets of splendid and powerful steam-ships, so that the most insiguificant corner of the earth has felt their influence, the Government of England, holding the destinies of India in its haud, have neglected the roads, rivers, aud harbours of that country, until the transit over a few miles doubles and trebles the cost of heavy produce. Neglect is not the sum total of criminality: obstacles have been placed in the way of freedom of exchange. Taking the distance from Bombay to Liverpool at 11,500 miles, and from New Orleans at 6000, it will be seen that the cotton of India travels double the distance travelled by American cotton. If, however, Indian cotton were no longer obliged to go rounnd by the Cape of Good Hope, but could pass through Egypt by the Suez Canal, the sea voyage from India would be reduced to about 6500 miles, or nearly the same distance as from New Orleans to Liverpool. This reduction of the sea voyage by 5000 miles in length and about six weeks in duration, and the consequent reduction in the cost of all articles at the place of consumption, applies to everything produced in India and the East and consumed in England, and to everything made in England and used in India and the East.

Engineers have long ago told us that a canal across the Isthmus of Suez is a feasible project—history tells us one has already had existence. Capitalists have long been prepared to produce the necessary funds, and commercial men have advocated the project, but opposition existed in a quarter where only one man anticipated it. Nine years ago Mr. Urquhart said:—

"It will pass belief that an English Minister should have opposed such a work; but what can I urge more than I have done? I have shown the interest of Russia, the dependence in every case of the Minister; I have referred to facts, I have given names. If what I say is not the truth, it must be contradicted; if not contradicted, it must be that contradiction is impossible. These details have been published before, and have not been contradicted. Unless it was an object to prevent the canal, must it not have been made? It is a case in which there is no middle course."—*Progress of Russia*, p. 429.

Four years later the English Minister here alluded to spoke, not to contradict, but to confirm the correctness of the judgment here expressed. He then said, July 7, 1857:—

"For the last fifteen years Her Majesty's Government have used all the influence they possess *at Constantinople* AND *in Egypt* to prevent the scheme from being carried into execution."

Though want of cotton is the principal, it is not the only cause of distress. Those causes are numerous, and are to be found in the secret and mysterious acts of the Government: they consist in suffering the violation of British rights in foreign countries (by the Russian tariff on Poland, and the French tariff on Algiers); imposing treaties carrying high export duties on the produce of foreign countries (Turkey and Morocco), submitting to illegal blockades (Mexico and Buenos Ayres), carrying on unjust and illegal wars (China, Persia, Affghanistan, &c.), convulsing, by diplomatic action, couutries available as sources of supply, or as markets for sale (Mexico, the Republics of Rio de la Plata, Naples, Sicily, and the Ottoman Empire), aud neglecting or frustrating treaties of commerce, and thus disabling us from profiting by the reduction of import duties in 1842 and subsequently.

If, then, the cotton manufacturer has to close his mill, and the operatives of Lancashire are starving, it is because they have been heedless of those things on which their bread depends, and have thus fostered the plans of those who are plotting against their prosperity and the country's existence. Periods of panic and distress will continue to occur so long as that heedlessness exists; as the only means by which to avert their occurrence we invite our fellow-countrymen to a participation in the duties of citizenship, by attention to public affairs.

By order of the Conference,
Joseph Foden, Secretary.
Hall-street, Greenheys, Mancheste

Cotton from India.

From the Free Press *of August* 6, 1862.

When it was said, years ago, "England will only know the value of India when she has lost it," it was intended to be conveyed that India possessed a value not suspected, and it was intended to be insinuated that Englishmen were—"blind mice." Only the meaning was not taken.

The cotton supply from America having fallen short; when the announcement has been made that cotton of the finest quality has come from India, and the geographic acquirements of the people have informed them that India is very large, and that the way to it by Suez is comparatively short, the application of the proverb is both clear and immediate; the reader requires not so much as a go-cart to say to himself, "Poor blind mice!" If of a reflective turn of mind, he will add, "fit to be cut up with a carving-knife."

India is not a solitary instance. Blindness does not consist in not seeing a particular tree or a certain house, but in the paralysis and obscuration of the nerves which convey to the thinking part of the man the impressions made by external objects on the visual organ. England learns the value of whatever she possesses only after she has lost it. But this blindness is not the result of the inability of the nerves to convey impressions to the brain, but of the suppression of the brain itself. This is a phenomen which never can manifest itself in individual existences, because when the brain goes life goes too. An aggregate body takes some time to dissolve after the brain is gone, and even exhibits in all its members for a time the lively and hilarious activity of maggots.

That this solution of the mystery is the true one is capable of demonstration. A blind man may remain in ignorance of circumstances passing before his eyes, but his blindness will not prevent him from knowing the words he utters or the acts he performs. Now England is in one and the same ignorance of the language she uses, of the steps she takes, of the blows she strikes, of the hits she receives, as of the objects presented to her eyes.

She has been very busy for some twenty-five years in preventing the culture of cotton in India. She has been for twenty years busy in stopping the opening of a passage, which would bring the cotton produced in India six thousand miles nearer to her (the Canal of Suez). She has been for seventeen years busy in opening a communication through Central America, for the United States to supplant our exports to the Indian Seas, and so to diminish the quantity of raw cotton supplied to England, or to lay upon it an export duty. This practice of being ignorant of what she is about has become chronic: her present Premier told her thirty-two years ago, that "*she only knew her own acts by the news which reached her from abroad.*" On becoming minister himself the ensuing year, he completed the experiment by preventing her from knowing what she did, even by news reaching her from abroad.

That the brain is itself gone, is further shown in this, that when at length it learns what it has been doing all these years, and learns it, not through its organs but through its flesh, being punched and jammed up by the results of what it has been doing, it does not proceed to do what a brain would do, namely, to consider the causes, in order that it might find the remedy, but the poor infatuated lungs and lips shout out, "Glorious news from India!" "Reform of Parliament!" "Monetary Crisis!" "Crisis got over by suspension of Bank Act!" besides a great many other insane things.

Lord Dalhousie, in that minute which caps every other exhibition of a tongue wagging without a brain behind it, gives, as one of the reasons for the annexation of Berar, that that territory is very valuable for the growth of cotton!

We have now a request to make to the reader, whom we have been entertaining with the view of this madwoman's antics; let him make us some compensation by following the subjoined statement:

THE SUEZ CANAL AS AFFECTING THE FOOD OF LANCASHIRE AND THE TRANQUILLITY OF ENGLAND.

The *Zeit*, Prussian journal, has published (in 1857) two articles on the Suez Canal. The first, after pointing out the want, from the remotest periods, of a direct intercourse between the East and the West, contains an historical account of the canal from the first attempts of the Pharaohs until the labours of the International Commission, and of M. de Lesseps, to realise this great desideratum. The article treats of the English and Turkish Governments with respect to the Suez Canal. The *Zeit* is not correct in its views respecting Turkey, losing sight of the circumstance that, although the Porte has not given its sanction, it has nevertheless approved of the undertaking in an official letter published two years before. The Prussian journal admits that the Suez Canal must render Constantinople one of the most important ports in the world.

The *Zeit* regards the opposition of English statesmen as very strange, seeing that the completion of the canal has comparatively much more importance for England than for any other country, besides the immense utility it would have in a political point of view for the maintenance of her dominions in the East. There is, however, another circumstance which should exercise even a greater influence than the tenure of the English possessions—that is, the cotton question.

"The material development of England" (says the *Zeit*), "the dominant position she occupies in the world, her national wealth, have all their central nucleus in the cotton question. There can be no doubt but that it is a great drawback to England to be obliged to take seven-eighths of her supplies from America, when she has in India a soil capable of supplying the raw material; and that even the insufficient quantity India produces at present should be hampered by a long voyage round the Cape. On the other hand, the Americans begin to find it an advantage to manufacture the raw material, instead of shipping it to Europe and getting it returned in the shapo of manufactured goods; since by manufacturing at home a saving is effected in the transport charges, duty, commission, &c. Now, though wages in America are still too high to admit of a successful competition with British manufactures, it must not be lost sight of that the Government *may at any time raise the export duty*, with a view of protecting national industry. Nor must the circumstance be overlooked that the Americans intend establishing a military route along the western coast of the United States to an important port in the Pacific Ocean. American commerce is busy in preparing new outlets to China and the Philippine Islands, &c., with the aid of which the Americans will enter into very strong competition with England in their most important ports—Canton, Bombay, and Calcutta. *The voyage from America to India across the Pacific Ocean, when the canal of the Isthmus of Panama is established, will be forty per cent. shorter than the present route by the Cape of Good Hope.* Therefore, if England rejects an enterprise which will give it an advance of 3000 nautical miles over the American shipping, and which would reduce the voyage from London to Calcutta to thirty-six days, how will she be able to stand against a competition in cotton goods with a rival who, besides possessing the advantage of being able to furnish the raw material from forty to fifty per cent. cheaper, has that of less costly transport? Under these circumstances, would it not be more profitable for England to leave a portion of her commeree with China and India to the ports in the Mediterranean, such as Marseilles, Trieste, Genoa, Venice, &c., rather than risk the loss of her commerce with those vast territories?

"No other country can hope to derive so much benefit from the Suez Canal as England. At present, the only obstacle to the triumph of science over what has been allowed to exist for forty centuries, *is the narrow-minded and jealous policy of English statesmen.*"

So far the *Zeit*—that is to say, the *Times* of Prussia, which takes the trouble to inform England of her real interests and her real dangers, and especially of these two—the possibility of an American export duty on cotton, and of the convulsion of British trade in the East by American exports from the western side of their continent, whether transported by rail or by the projected Panama Canal. Beside this statement, we beg to place what has been so often pointed out in these pages—that the Panama Canal has been urged by the same statesman who for twenty years has thwarted the Suez Canal; that the Panama Canal was used to thwart the Suez Canal, and as we have shown by figures, would be injurious to British interests, by giving an immense superiority to American trade. The Statesman, then, who has frustrated the one object and urged the other—the first being considered by the *Zeit* as almost exclusively advantageous to England, and the second as ruinous to her—cannot be logically defined as a "narrow-minded" man, as certainly his course cannot be described as a "jealous policy." In all the equations brought for solution to the statesmen and politicians of Europe, Lord Palmerston is the x, or the quantity which remains unknown, until the calculation is properly worked out. The operation, indeed, consists solely in the x being unknown.

Now let us turn to the *Times* of England, where, perhaps, we may find the x even without the trouble of the calculation. On the 6th of November, 1857, it writes as follows:—

"*A canal joining the Atlantic and Pacific oceans is every day becoming more and more a necessity.* The Americans can hardly reconcile themselves to the notion that the route from New York to San Francisco is always to be round Cape Horn; nor can we help seeing that the

nearest way to *our Australian Colonies* is across the Gulf of Mexico. It seems now high time to think about this great work, which we believe was once *proposed by* the United States Government, and cordially approved by our own. But, whether the canal is to be in Nicaragua or at Panama, it is necessary that the whole region should be tranquillised," &c.

It is impossible that whoever wrote these lines should not have been fully aware of all that was known to, and declared by, the *Zeit*. These lines ere written for the concealment of those alarming truths, and to advance a scheme for the sacrificing of British commerce in the East, for the driving of the mills of Lancashire out of work, for the convulsion of England herself. Whose design can this be? Not of the *Times* in its visible character of a commercial speculation; not of the English Government, as composed of men whose fortunes must sink in the ruin thus prepared—It is the design of the man who was made Foreign Minister by the influence of the Russian Ambassadress over Lord Grey, and who, without associate, councillor, or confidant in England, has obtained the mastery over England, being himself in dread of every individual that walks her soil, should that individual become cognisant of his purposes, or of the bond held over him by that foreign power who has made him what he is.

These lines have not been written for the present occasion. Five years have elapsed since they were penned,* five years during which the exposition has been of no avail. Five years during which the course pointed out and denounced has been followed, not only without arousing public resistance, but without awakening individual suspicion. In adapting it for the present occasion, we have altered to the present date the number of years during which this course of perfidy has continued. During these five years nothing has passed on the subject except that Lord PALMERSTON contradicted in June, 1858, the statement that he had made in July, 1857, that he had for fifteen years opposed the cutting of the Suez Canal. Even this contradiction did not excite suspicion.*

What appears in other journals diminishes in value with time; what is published in these columns increases in interest in exact proportion to the time that has elapsed. In a Russian history of triumphs achieved, the despatches which laid down beforehand the results to be afterwards attained, would find their place in the narrative just as much as the events themselves. Everybody who knows anything knows that in these times events never happen, but things are done. What is done is done because it is planned, and what one person can plan another person possessed of his intentions can predict. No real history can be written of the fortunes of England which does not record these predictions and the more so as they are written with the constant aim of falsifying themselves by the acceptance of the warnings given.

SYSTEMATIC RESISTANCE TO THE GROWTH OF COTTON.

(*From the Times, of June* 27, 1857.)

The Court of Directors allow that were the valley of Berar connected with Bombay by railway, Liverpool could get all the cotton she wants for twopence-halfpenny per pound, all land and sea charges included. The distance is short of four hundred miles. The cost of construction of railways in India is 5000*l.* a mile, or 2,000,000*l.* in all, a sum which would be covered by three months of the extra penny to America, or three weeks of the sacrifice occasioned by working short time. It is just four years since this admission was made by the Court of Directors. Since then they have contrived to construct some fifty miles of the Berar line. The remainder has not so much as been sanctioned up to the present hour, and we shall probably have five years' correspondence before the first bar is laid. Cotton of the very best quality can be purchased from the cultivator at from one penny farthing to twopence per pound. About double this is expended in transport charges. A twelvemonth ago a large body of Ratiawar merchants undertook to construct a cotton pier in the Gulf of Cambay, on the territory of an independent chief, and just opposite Ghora Bunoa, when Government lamented their inability to construct one, and leave was refused them by the Bombay authorities. Lord ELPHINSTONE, on visiting the chief of Bhownuggar, in 1854, recommended him to construct a pier, to make roads, and to establish cotton presses. The chief replied that all these had long been in his contemplation, that he was quite ready to proceed with them immediately, if Government would only undertake not to strip him of his dominions. A body of Bombay native merchants applied for leave to construct a tide basin for cargo-boats at the Presidency, on any terms or conditions the Government were pleased to impose. Permission was refused them. An irrigation company was established at Bombay in 1854, and half a million of stock immediately applied for at the Presidency. Terms every way satisfactory were granted by the Bombay Government. The survey is now completed, and operations ready to be commenced, when the supreme Government steps in and pronounces the terms too advantageous. For the past twelve months the copartnery have been memorialising Cannon-row and Leadenhall-street, and applying to Parliament for papers, and that with the cordial concurrence of the Bombay Government, but have failed up to this hour to obtain any answer as to the terms likely to be granted them.

* See *Free Press* for 15th and 11th November, 1857.

* THE SUEZ CANAL.

LORD PALMERSTON, JULY 7, 1857.

"For the last fifteen years Her Majesty's Government have used all the influence they possess at *Constantinople* AND *in Egypt* to prevent the scheme from being carried into execution."

LORD PALMERSTON, JUNE 1, 1858.

"*We are told now* that for fifteen years we have been exercising a moral constraint upon the Sultan of Turkey to prevent him giving his sanction to this scheme. Now, I can assure those who hold that opinion that they are entirely mistaken."

"FREE PRESS" OFFICE, 4, EAST TEMPLE CHAMBERS, LONDON; AND JOHN HEYWOOD, DEANSGATE, MANCHESTER.
August 9, 1862.